

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16 and 18-35 are in the application.

Claims 1, 13, 26, 30, and 33-35 are amended.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Applicant proposes, without prejudice or disclaimer, to simplify the issues presented for prosecution and/or appeal, and amend claims 1-33 and 35 to recite the essential features of claims 2 and/or 3, that is, the screen resolution is automatically changed, and the prior state stored or restored automatically.

In reviewing the Examiner's rationale for rejecting claims 2, the examiner cites Matthews page 222, which states simply that the default SIZE of an image is 600 x 64 pixels, and does not address at all the screen resolution and any automated adjustment thereof. Thus, as stated by the Examiner, the size can be automatically adjusted, but this has no impact on the screen resolution. The reason why the screen output is distinguished from the underlying data used to generate the screen output is that the screen display may result from a plurality of applications and/or operating system. A simple example is the overlay of the cursor over the window in a GUI. The cursor might be represented in the screen capture, while not in the underlying data defining the object. It is noted that computer operating systems may alter icon representations, menus, etc. based on the selected screen resolution, so that the result of changing screen resolution is not always a simple scaling of the output. Claims corresponding to claim 3 are believed distinguished on the same fundamental basis.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the prior art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest that a computer display/screen resolution be changed, and indeed teaches that one can simply logically or algorithmically resize the image object, a distinct and contradictory scheme.

Claim 34 represents a combination with claim 11, admitted by the Examiner to correspond to former claim 35. This is a somewhat different invention, and is believed to be patentable essentially as previously presented. Claim 34, as amended, introduces the concept of a "master" page and an "answer" page which seeks to emulate the correct page, the results of which are compared. None of the references teaches or suggests that


/D

the systems disclosed therein be used as a query or query-response analysis system.

Reconsideration of the rejection thereof is respectfully requested.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Hoffberg  
Reg. 33,511

MILDE & HOFFBERG, LLP  
10 Bank Street - Suite 460  
White Plains, NY 10606  
(914) 949-3100